arXiv:1108.1606v1 [math.CO] 8 Aug 2011

Degree-equipartite graphs

Kh. Bibak and M. H. Shirdareh Haghighi
Department of Mathematics
Shiraz University
Shiraz 71454
Iran
khmath@gmail.com
shirdareh@susc.ac.ir

Abstract

A graph G of order $2n$ is called degree-equipartite if for every n-element set $A \subseteq V(G)$, the degree sequences of the induced subgraphs $G[A]$ and $G[V(G) \setminus A]$ are the same. In this paper, we characterize all degree-equipartite graphs. This answers Problem 1 in the paper by Grünbaum et al [B. Grünbaum, T. Kaiser, D. Král, and M. Rosenfeld, Equipartite graphs, *Israel J. Math.* **168** (2008), 431-444].

Mathematics Subject Classification 2010: primary 05C75, secondary 05C07

Keyword: degree-equipartite graph; equipartite graph; spectral-equipartite graph; weakly equipartite graph

1 Introduction

In this paper, all graphs are assumed to be simple, i.e., without any loops and multiple edges. A graph G of order $2n$ is called *weakly equipartite* if for every partition of $V(G)$ into two sets A and B of n vertices each, the subgraphs of G induced by A and B are isomorphic. If there is an automorphism of G mapping A onto B then G is called equipartite ([4]). Plainly, every equipartite graph is weakly equipartite.

Theorem 1. *[4, Theorem 13] A graph G of order $2n$ is weakly equipartite if and only if it is one of the following graphs:*

$$2nK_1,\ \ nK_2,\ \ 2C_4,\ \ K_{n,n} \setminus nK_2,\ \ \text{and}\ \ 2K_n$$

or one of their complements

$$K_{2n},\ \ K_{2n} \setminus nK_2,\ \ K_8 \setminus 2C_4,\ \ 2K_n + nK_2\ \ \text{and}\ \ K_{n,n}.$$

It is interesting that the graphs in the theorem above are also equipartite. Therefore, we have:

Corollary 2. *[4, Corollary 14] A graph G of order $2n$ is equipartite if and only if it is weakly equipartite.*

According to [4, Section 5], a relaxation of the notion of equipartite graphs seems to be of some interest:
A graph G of order $2n$ is called *degree-equipartite* if for every n-element set $A \subseteq V(G)$, the degree sequences of the induced subgraphs $G[A]$ and $G[V(G)\backslash A]$ are the same. Grünbaum et al [4, Problem 1] asked: Which graphs G are degree-equipartite? In particular, is there a degree-equipartite graph which is not equipartite?

By the definition of a degree-equipartite graph, one can immediately conclude that:

Proposition 3. *The complement of a degree-equipartite graph is also degree-equipartite.*

In this paper, we show that:

Theorem 4. *A graph of even order is degree-equipartite if and only if it is weakly equipartite.*

We prove this theorem through some modifications of the machinery of P. Kelly and D. Merriell in [5].

The notion of a weakly equipartite graph was initially introduced by Kelly and Merriell in [5], but they have a different terminology. Indeed, their phrase for a weakly equipartite graph, is a graph which "has all bisections" and they reach to the same characterization of such graphs as in Theorem 1 ([5, Theorems 4,5]). But if we carefully look at all statements proved there, that are for characterizing graphs which have all bisections, we find that the proofs can be modified for characterizing degree-equipartite graphs. In fact, Kelly and Merriell do not use the full power of the isomorphism between $G[A]$ and $G[V(G)\backslash A]$, in most situations. We realized that instead of using isomorphisms, they are working with the degree sequences of $G[A]$ and $G[V(G)\backslash A]$, except when they are characterizing disconnected weakly equipartite graphs; in which they are using the isomorphism between $G[A]$ and $G[V(G)\backslash A]$ ([5, Theorem 3]). We provide a proof for characterizing disconnected degree-equipartite graphs (Theorem 6 below) and modify other proofs of [5] to be applicable to connected degree-equipartite graphs.

2 Proofs and Techniques

First, we state the following theorem from [5] which is intriguing in its own right.

Theorem 5. *[5, Theorem 1] An even order graph G is regular if and only if for every partition of $V(G)$ into two equal-sized sets A and B, the induced subgraphs $G[A]$ and $G[B]$ have the same number of edges.*

By the theorem above, we conclude that every degree-equipartite graph of order $2n$ is regular with degree, say k. When $k = 0$, we have the empty graph, and when $k = 1$ we get nK_2; both degree-equipartite. So, let us study the case $k > 1$. First, we characterize all disconnected degree-equipartite graphs.

Theorem 6. *If G is a disconnected k-regular degree-equipartite graph of order $2n$ with $k > 1$, then it consists of two components; these are either two complete graphs of order n or else are two 4-cycles.*

Proof. Let $G_1, \ldots, G_h$ denote the components of G with the corresponding orders $r_1 \geq r_2 \geq \ldots \geq r_h \geq k+1$. Let i, $1 \leq i \leq h$, be the first index such that $s := \sum_{j=1}^{i} r_j \geq n$. If $s > n$, put $\alpha = r_i - s + n$. Clearly, $0 < \alpha < r_i$. Choose arbitrary $R \subseteq V(G_i)$ with $|R| = \alpha$. Now consider the n-element subset $A = V(G_1) \cup \ldots \cup V(G_{i-1}) \cup R$ of $V(G)$ and its complement B. If R contains an isolated vertex a, since G is degree-equipartite, there exists a corresponding isolated vertex b in B, which must belong to $B \cap V(G_i)$. By switching a and b, the number of edges in $G[A]$ and $G[B]$ increases, and hence by continuing this process as long as isolated vertices exist in $G[A]$, we eventually obtain the n-element subset A' with no isolated vertex in $G[A']$. Now choose a vertex $u \in R' = A' \cap V(G_i)$ that has a neighbour in $V(G_i) \setminus R'$ and switch it with a vertex $v \in V(G_h)$. The vertex v in $A'' = (A' \setminus \{u\}) \cup \{v\}$ is isolated in $G[A'']$ while there is no isolated vertex in $G[V(G) \setminus A'']$. This contradiction shows that $s = n$, i.e., $|V(G_1) \cup \ldots \cup V(G_i)| = |V(G_{i+1}) \cup \ldots \cup V(G_h)| = n$. If $h > 2$, then $i < h-1$. Now consider two adjacent vertices x and y in G_1, and two vertices $z \in V(G_{h-1})$ and $t \in V(G_h)$. The subgraphs induced by $(V(G_1) \cup \ldots \cup V(G_i) \setminus \{x, y\}) \cup \{z, t\}$ and $(V(G_{i+1}) \cup \ldots \cup V(G_h) \setminus \{z, t\}) \cup \{x, y\}$ have not the same degree sequences. So $h = 2$ and $r_1 = r_2 = n$. If G_1 is not complete, then there exist two nonadjacent vertices p and q in G_1. On the other hand, let p' and q' be two adjacent vertices in G_2. Then the subgraphs induced by $(V(G_1) \setminus \{p, q\}) \cup \{p', q'\}$ and $(V(G_2) \setminus \{p', q'\}) \cup \{p, q\}$ have not the same degree sequences, unless $G = 2C_4$. If $G \neq 2C_4$, then G_1 and similarly G_2, are complete graphs. □

To characterize connected degree-equipartite graphs, we follow the approach of Kelly and Merriell in [5] with somewhat different proofs. For a vertex v of a graph G, denote by $N(v)$ the set of neighbours of v in G. Also, we put $\hat{N}(v) = N(v) \cup \{v\}$ and

$$F(v) = \{x \in V(G) : \ \hat{N}(x) \cap \hat{N}(v) = \emptyset\}.$$

To begin, we adopt Lemmas 1 and 2 of [5] for degree-equipartite graphs:

Lemma 7. *If G is a connected k-regular degree-equipartite graph of order $2n$ with $1 < k \leq n-1$, then $N(u) \neq N(v)$ for every two distinct vertices u and v of G.*

Proof. Assume that $N(u) = N(v)$ for some distinct vertices u and v of G. Consider an n-subset A of $V(G)$ with $u \in A$, and $\hat{N}(v) \subseteq B$, where $B = V(G) \setminus A$. Since G is connected, we can choose B such that $G[B]$ is connected. But in this case $G[A]$ has an isolated vertex u, while $G[B]$ has not. □

Lemma 8. *If G is a connected k-regular degree-equipartite graph of order $2n$ with $1 < k \leq n-1$, then $|F(u)| = n - k$ for every vertex u of G.*

Proof. We prove this lemma in three steps. Let u be any vertex of G. First, we show that $|F(u)| \geq n - k$. Consider an n-subset A of $V(G)$ such that $\hat{N}(u) \subseteq A$. Set $B = V(G) \setminus A$. Since $G[A]$ and $G[B]$ have the same degree sequences, there exists a vertex $w_1 \in B$ such that w_1 has degree k in $G[B]$. So $w_1 \in F(u)$. If $k = n-1$, then clearly $|F(u)| \geq n - k = 1$. Now suppose $k < n-1$. Let $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_{n-k-1}$ denote the vertices in A which are not in $\hat{N}(u)$. Switch v_1 and w_1, that is, let $A' = (A \setminus \{v_1\}) \cup \{w_1\}$ and $B' = (B \setminus \{w_1\}) \cup \{v_1\}$. Obviously, w_1 is an isolated vertex of $G[A']$ which belongs to $F(u)$. Again, we have a vertex w_2 of degree k in $G[B']$, which we switch it with v_2. Continuing in this way, we ultimately get an n-subset A_1 of $V(G)$ such that

$$A_1 = \hat{N}(u) \cup \{w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_{n-k-1}\} \quad \text{and} \quad \{w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_{n-k-1}\} \subseteq F(u).$$

Furthermore, we have still a vertex, say w_{n-k}, of degree k in $G[B_1]$ which belongs to $F(u)$, too. Therefore, $|F(u)| \geq n - k$.

Second, we prove that $|F(u)| < n-1$. In contrary, suppose that $|F(u)| \geq n-1$. Consider an n-subset A of $V(G)$ such that $u \in A$ and $|A \cap F(u)| = n-1$. Then $N(u) \subseteq B$, where $B = V(G) \setminus A$. Since u in $G[A]$ is isolated, there exists an isolated vertex v in $G[B]$. In view of $k > 1$, we have also $v \in F(u)$. Hence $|F(u)| \geq n$. Now let A_1 be an n-subset of $V(G) \cap F(u)$ and $B_1 = V(G) \setminus A_1$. We have $\hat{N}(u) \subseteq B_1$. If there is an isolated vertex w in $G[B_1]$, then as before $w \in F(u)$; switch it with some vertex x in A_1 which has a neighbour in B_1. Such a vertex x exists in A_1 because G is connected. Continuing in this way, we finally arrive at two disjoint n-subsets A_2 and B_2 of $V(G)$ such that $A_2 \subseteq F(u)$, $\hat{N}(u) \subseteq B_2$, and $G[B_2]$ has no isolated vertex. Now switch u and a vertex z in A_2 that has a neighbour in B_2. Let $A_3 = (A_2 \setminus \{z\}) \cup \{u\}$ and $B_3 = (B_2 \setminus \{u\}) \cup \{z\}$. Then $G[A_3]$ has the isolated vertex u, while $G[B_3]$ has not, because $k > 1$. This contradiction shows that $|F(u)| < n-1$.

Third, consider an n-subset C of $V(G)$ such that $u \in C$, $F(u) \subseteq C$, and $N(u) \subseteq D$, where $D = V(G) \setminus C$. Since every vertex of D which is not in $N(u)$ has some neighbour in $N(u)$, so the isolated vertex, say s, of $G[D]$ corresponding to $u \in C$ is in $N(u)$. Then $N(s) \subseteq C$. Since $N(s)$ and $F(u)$ both are subsets of C and disjoint, we have $|F(u)| \leq n-k$. □

Now we apply the techniques of Theorem 5 of [5] to connected degree-equipartite graphs.

Theorem 9. *If G is a connected k-regular degree-equipartite graph of order $2n$ with $1 < k \leq n-1$, then $G = K_{n,n} \setminus nK_2$.*

Proof. Let u be an arbitrary vertex of G. Consider the class $\mathcal{C}$ of all partitions (A, B) of $V(G)$ with $|A| = |B| = n$, such that $\{u\} \cup F(u) \subseteq A$ and $N(u) \subseteq B$. The isolated vertex of $G[B]$ corresponding to $u \in A$ must necessarily belong to $N(u)$; otherwise it would be in $F(u)$ and hence in A. Furthermore, for each partition in $\mathcal{C}$, $N(u)$ has exactly one vertex isolated in $G[B]$. For if there were two, say v_1 and v_2, then $N(v_1)$ and $N(v_2)$ would both consist of the k vertices of A not in $F(u)$, contradicting Lemma 7.

Let v denote the unique isolated vertex of $G[B]$ corresponding to $u \in A$. So $A = F(u) \cup N(v)$. Therefore, different partitions in $\mathcal{C}$ have different vertices isolated in $G[B]$. Consequently, $|\mathcal{C}| \leq k$ because we have k vertices in $N(u)$. On the other hand, A has $k-1$ unspecified vertices out of $n-1$ vertices not fixed in A or B. So, there are $\binom{n-1}{k-1}$ elements in $\mathcal{C}$. If $k < n-1$, then

$$\binom{n-1}{k-1} \geq n-1 > k.$$

This contradiction shows that $k = n-1$, and hence there exist $\binom{n-1}{k-1} = n-1$ elements in $\mathcal{C}$. Thus, we have $n-1$ isolated vertices in $G[N(u)]$, i.e., $N(u)$ is a stable set in G. Now consider $A_1 = F(u) \cup N(u)$ which is a stable n-subset of $V(G)$. Hence $B_1 = V(G) \setminus A_1$ is also a stable set. It follows that G is a $(n-1)$-regular bipartite graph, and in fact $G = K_{n,n} \setminus nK_2$. □

Now, we are ready to characterize all degree-equipartite graphs, which results in Theorem 4.

Theorem 10. *A graph G of order $2n$ is degree-equipartite if and only if it is one of the following graphs:*

$$2nK_1,\ \ nK_2,\ \ 2C_4,\ \ K_{n,n} \setminus nK_2,\ \ \text{and}\ \ 2K_n$$

or one of their complements

$$K_{2n},\ \ K_{2n} \setminus nK_2,\ \ K_8 \setminus 2C_4,\ \ 2K_n + nK_2\ \ \text{and}\ \ K_{n,n}.$$

Proof. By Theorem 1, all the graphs above are weakly equipartite, and so are degree-equipartite. For the converse, let G be a k-regular degree-equipartite graph of order $2n$. We have the following cases:

- If $k = 0$, then $G = 2nK_1$.
- If $k = 1$, then $G = nK_2$.
- If $k > 1$, and G is disconnected, then $G = 2K_n$ or $G = 2C_4$, by Theorem 6.
- If $1 < k \leq n - 1$, and G is connected, then $G = K_{n,n} \setminus nK_2$.
- If $n - 1 < k < 2n - 2$, then G is connected. If G^c is disconnected, then G^c is a $(2n - k - 1)$-regular degree-equipartite graph by Proposition 3. Hence, since $2n - k - 1 > 1$, we have $G^c = 2K_n$, or $G^c = 2C_4$ by Theorem 6. Consequently, $G = K_{n,n}$, or $G = K_8 \setminus 2C_4$. If G^c is connected, since we have $1 < 2n - k - 1 \leq n - 1$, then $G^c = K_{n,n} \setminus nK_2$ by Theorem 9, and so $G = 2K_n + nK_2$.
- If $k = 2n - 2$, then G^c is a 1-regular graph, and hence $G = K_{2n} \setminus nK_2$.
- If $k = 2n - 1$, then $G = K_{2n}$.

□

3 Some Remarks

Igor Shparlinski ([6]) proposed the following problem:

Problem 1. Let G be a graph of order $2n$ such that for every n-element set $A \subseteq V(G)$, the induced subgraphs $G[A]$ and $G[V(G)\setminus A]$ are isospectral. Let us call these graphs *spectral-equipartite*. Which graphs are spectral-equipartite?

Suppose G is a graph of order $2n$ and size m, with eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_{2n}$. It is known that $m = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{2n} {\lambda_i}^2$ (see, e.g., [3]). So, by Theorem 5, the suggested graphs by Shparlinski are regular. A full characterization of spectral-equipartite graphs seems to be an interesting problem.

Remark 2. We independently introduced the notion of weakly equipartite graphs in [1]. We called such graphs *well-bisective*, and using techniques very similar but slightly weaker than those used in [5] and [4], could characterize all disconnected well-bisective graphs and also all bipartite well-bisective graphs. Later, we found that similar work are done in [5] and [4].

Remark 3. The definition of a degree-equipartite graph (and so, weakly equipartite graph) has no nontrivial generalization to more than two parts, by Exercise 2.2.25 of [2].

Remark 4. The proof techniques which are used in [5] may be useful to attack the Reconstruction Conjecture.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Igor Shparlinski for proposing Problem 1 and useful comments on this manuscript. They are also grateful to the anonymous referee for a careful reading of the paper and helpful suggestions.

References

[1] Kh. Bibak and M. H. Shirdareh Haghighi, Well-Bisective graphs, *IPM 20 Combin. Conf. 2009*, May 15-21, 2009, IPM, Tehran, Iran.

[2] J.A. Bondy and U.S.R. Murty, *Graph Theory*, Springer-Verlag, New York (2008).

[3] D. Cvetkovič, M. Doob and H. Sachs, Spectra of Graphs: Theory and Applications, third ed., Johann Ambrosius Barth, Heidelberg (1995).

[4] B. Grünbaum, T. Kaiser, D. Král, and M. Rosenfeld, Equipartite graphs, *Israel J. Math.* **168** (2008), 431-444.

[5] P. Kelly and D. Merriell, A class of graphs, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **96** (1960), 488–492.

[6] I. E. Shparlinski, Private communication, (2010).